

REMARKS



Claims 14 and 15 are pending. A Final Office Action mailed July 8, 2008 rejected Claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant hereby amends Claims 14 and 15 and adds new Claims 16 and 17. Applicant hereby respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 14 and 15 as being anticipated by Caronni et al. (hereinafter Caronni). The Final Office Action states that Caronni teaches that if the request to join is associated with a multicast broadcast address, then the multicast broadcast IP address is removed, the multicast broadcast is decrypted and a different IP multicast address is attached. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that participant key management that is being performed by Caronni is not the same as the manipulation of the IP addresses that is presently claimed. The Public-Private key encryption described by Caronni is well known – see <http://computer.howstuffworks.com/encryption2.htm>. This website describes Public-Private key encryption. There is no mention that a key is in any way similar to an IP address – see discussion about multicast IP address <http://computer.howstuffworks.com/question5491.htm>. Applicant submits that participant key management of Caronni and the manipulation of the IP addresses that is presently claimed are mutually exclusive and could be performed

simultaneously.



The picture above illustrates a potential implementation of the present invention (titled Stewart). It also demonstrates how the present invention differs from Caronni. This illustration was discussed in an interview in early November that was attended by S. Zia, I. Stewart, and M. Smith.

The present invention translates point-to-multipoint addresses. The example depicts that Caronni transmits on 224.x.x.x before and after the network interface. The present invention dynamically repeats the transmission of 239.x.x.x on 224.x.x.x at the network interface, hence the end user is presented with an entirely different point-to-multipoint address.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Caronni fails to teach or suggest removing the multicast broadcast IP address, decrypting the sent multicast broadcast, attaching one of an associated or a local IP multicast address to the decrypted multicast broadcast, and sending the decrypted multicast broadcast to the user system requesting to join.

Thus, Applicant believes that new Claims 14 and 15 allowable over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's agent listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}



Michael S. Smith
Registration No. 39,563
Direct Dial: 206.749.9888

25315

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 6 -

WRLD-1-1013ROAS

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}



701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98104
206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301